DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 669 EC 231 855

AUTHOR Norlander, Kay A.; And Others
TITLE Diagnosis and Program Selection for Learning Disabled College Students. Special Education Center Publication Series, Document Number LDC9.
INSTITUTION Connecticut Univ., Storrs. School of Education.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; College Students; *Counseling Services; *Educational Diagnosis; Higher Education; *Learning Disabilities; Psychological Evaluation; Psychometrics; School Counselors; *Student Evaluation; Test Reliability; Test Selection; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS University of Connecticut

ABSTRACT

This study describes the University of Connecticut's Program for Learning Disabled College Students psychoeducational evaluation process with its components for analysis of aptitude, information processing, and academic skill levels. The resulting report is used to assist students in planning a course of study and delineating support services necessary to achieve specific academic goals. Test selection and psychometric factors are discussed as are reliability, norm analysis and validity findings for the core battery of tests. Pertinent traits of learning disabled students, support services, institutions and their special education programs are discussed as factors important to the planning and counseling services rendered learning disabled students. A suggested assessment battery and an outline of assessment and planning procedures are attached. Contains 24 references. (PB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED322669

Special Education Center Publication Series

Document Number: LDC9

Diagnosis and Program Selection for College Students with Learning Disabilities. K. Norlander, S. Shaw, J. McGuire, & A. Czajkowski (1987). Submitted to Learning Disabilities Focus.

University of Connecticut
School of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kay Norlander
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 231855

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIAGNOSIS AND PROGRAM SELECTION FOR LEARNING DISABLED COLLEGE STUDENTS

Kay A. Norlander, Ph.D.
The University of Connecticut

Stan F. Shaw, Ed.D.
The University of Connecticut

Joan M. McGuire, Ph.D.
The University of Connecticut

Ania Czajkowski, M.A.
The University of Connecticut

RUNNING HEAD: Program Selection

AUTHORS

Kay Norlander

Assistant Professor

Co-Director, Diagnostic and Prescriptive Service Unit of the Special Education Center, The University of Connecticut

Ph.D. - The University of Connecticut - 1984

Interests: LD College programming; diagnosis of LD adults

Stan Shaw

Professor

Acting Chair, Educational Psychology Department - The University of Connecticut

Ed.D. - University of Oregon - 1971

Interests: LD college programming; training LD college personnel

Joan McGuire

Assistant Professor

Director, University Program for Learning Disabled College Students - The University of Connecticut

Ph.D. - The University of Connecticut - 1982

Interests: LD college program development and evaluation

Ania Czajkowski

Education Director, Connecticut Junior Republic - Litchfield, CT

M.A. - The University of Connecticut - 1982

Interests: LD college programming

DIAGNOSIS AND PROGRAM SELECTION FOR
LEARNING DISABLED COLLEGE STUDENTS

Abstract

As students with specific learning disabilities seek admission to postsecondary educational settings in growing numbers, procedures for effectively serving this population must be established. Critical to the selection of an appropriate college setting, course of study, and planning for necessary support services, is the comprehensive delineation of each student's academic and learning strengths and weaknesses. The University of Connecticut's Program for Learning Disabled College Students has initiated a psychoeducational evaluation process which includes analysis of aptitude, information processing, and academic skill levels. The resulting psychoeducational evaluation report is used to assist the student in selecting a course of study and delineating support services necessary to achieve specific academic goals. The McGuire-Shaw Postsecondary Selection Guide for Learning Disabled Students, an instrument to systematically match characteristics of the learning disabled student, the postsecondary institution and the learning disability support program, is discussed as one method for assisting the student in selecting an appropriate college setting.

DIAGNOSIS AND PROGRAM SELECTION FOR LEARNING DISABLED COLLEGE STUDENTS

As students with specific learning disabilities seek admission to postsecondary educational settings in growing numbers, procedures for effectively serving this population must be established. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 directs postsecondary institutions to not only recruit and admit handicapped students in a nondiscriminatory fashion, but also to appropriately address their educational needs. Successful accomplishment of these challenges is largely dependent upon accurate and meaningful evaluation of the learning disabled (LD) postsecondary candidate.

Clearly, as educational support services have increased at the secondary level, students with learning disabilities have raised their expectations for continued services in postsecondary environments (Vetter, 1983). In fact, a survey by White, Alley, Deshler, Schumaker, Warner, and Clark (1982) reported that 67% of young adults diagnosed as LD while in public school had plans for postsecondary education. A position paper by the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (1985) outlines a number of concerns and recommendations relative to the problems adults with learning disabilities face as a heterogeneous population. Among these recommendations is the clear call for the selection of appropriate postsecondary educational and vocational training

settings based upon each individual's strengths and weaknesses. Specifically, this paper states:

> Selection of appropriate educational and vocational training programs and employment for adults with learning disabilities is predicated on a clear understanding of how their condition influences their learning and performance. Program selection and choice of intervention strategies must be based on the results of a comprehensive and integrated assessment of the individual that provides a description of specific patterns of abilities and disabilities. (p. 165)

If postsecondary institutions are to react to the position set forth by the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities and thereby provide services to this population, personnel must be prepared to assist students in not only the selection of the correct college (McGuire & Shaw, 1986) but also in planning appropriate educational goals. Accomplishing these tasks requires a comprehensive delineation of the learning strengths and weaknesses that each student brings to the academic environment. Further, the literature argues that a team evaluation approach and implementation of team intervention strategies are essential (Buktenica, 1970, 1980; Pfeiffer, 1980, 1981). Moreover, as professionals begin to actively identify postsecondary students with learning difficulties, procedures for making uniform diagnostic and placement decisions must be developed and implemented. A recent article by Vogel (1986) stresses

the importance of designing effective assessment procedures. Her article also illustrates the wide range of assessment practices currently being employed throughout the country.

The procedures outlined in this paper have a two-fold purpose: a) to identify a systematic, data-based approach to individualized programming for LD students at the postsecondary level, and b) to describe a comprehensive method to assist a LD student in selecting an appropriate postsecondary setting.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Mellard and Deshler (1984) direct college personnel toward the following questions in order to ensure effective evaluation of LD college students, leading to the development of appropriate programs for this population.

a. What attributional features are most appropriate for describing the condition of learning disabilities in postsecondary settings?

b. What type of evaluation system is most appropriate to insure monitoring of the identification system to determine its effectiveness in selecting true learning disabled students/clients?

c. How should intervention models be structured in light of salient identification variables?

d. How can identification and decision-making be structured to ensure consistency and fairness across different postsecondary settings? (p. 8 & 9)

In response to these questions, a team approach for identification and program planning was developed and

implemented by the UConn Program for LD College Students. Assessment in the areas of general ability, information processing, reading, writing, spelling, and mathematics, as well as study skills and social/ emotional status are included in appropriate combinations for each student. While formal or standardized evaluation procedures and instruments are employed, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching sessions are critical to the evaluation process.

Test Selection

The determination of an appropriate psychoeducational battery is best done by a team of professionals representing different disciplines. The overall psychometric soundness of each evaluation instrument should be evaluated as well as the appropriateness of the normative sample. Figure 1 illustrates a core battery of diagnostic instruments followed by a listing of instruments to be selected dependent upon areas requiring in-depth evaluation.

Insert Figure 1 about here.

The core battery of instruments was selected for its usefulness in assessing, in combination, general aptitude levels, learning processes, and academic abilities. Test instruments included are the Wechsler Adult Intelligence

Scale - Revised (Wechsler, 1981), the Bloomer Learning Test (Bloomer, 1978), and the Stanford Test of Academic Skills (Gardner, Callis, Merwin, and Rudman, 1983). An examination of the information gleaned from each of these instruments leads to the selection of additional evaluation devices.

Bloomer Learning Test (BLT). The BLT is designed on a somewhat different set of premises than most intelligence tests. Rather than testing information, vocabulary, item or general knowledge, the BLT evaluates the individual's ability to perform certain learning tasks. As it is virtually content free, its primary design is that of a learning diagnostic test. It should be utilized for learning disabled college students in conjunction with the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (WAIS-R).

The BLT produces ten major learning standard scores. The ten major scores are divided into five simple learning operations and five complex learning operations, each of which produces a learning I.Q. score. The BLT offers a profile of strengths and weaknesses in learning, thus enabling an instructor to facilitate improvement of the individual's learning strategies or techniques.

Reliability on the problem solving and simple learning IQ measures ranges from .89 to .97 and is adequate for making individual pupil decisions. Reliability of the subtest scores according to grade level range from .74 to .97 and,

for the most part, is adequate for individual subtest interpretation. Validity data is quite extensive and norms were developed on 2,200 students from grades one to adult. The sampling plan was developed based upon 1970 census data for sex, normal versus special education assignment (including gifted children), ethnic origin, and urban/rural population.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (WAIS-R). For the purposes of this paper, a comparison of the WAIS-R and the BLT is provided rather than a general explanation of the WAIS-R.

Results of the WAIS-R and the BLT are easily comparable as both instruments are designed employing a similar scale of measurement with intelligence and learning scores reported employing a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15.

As the BLT is measuring how new information is learned or processed, it is interesting to compare this information to WAIS-R scores, which to a certain degree measure information or abilities which have previously been acquired by the individual. On the other hand, the BLT learning subtests examine the process by which information is initially acquired.

Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK). The TASK is a test of basic academic skills normed for students in grades 8-13. Subtests included are Reading Vocabulary, Reading

Comprehension, Spelling, English, and Mathematics. Scores are reported in age equivalents, grade equivalents, stanines, and percentiles. This instrument is most useful as a screening measure of academic abilities. Follow-up diagnostic procedures outlined in Figure 1 are often employed to further evaluate areas of weakness.

Norms for the test are exceptionally good. Standardization of the test took place in May and October. Selection of students tested was based upon geographic region, community size, median years of schooling for persons over 25 in the community, types of school systems (public, private, and parochial), number of pupils per grade, and school cooperation. Reliabilities range from .85 to .95 and are adequate for making individual pupil decisions. Validity is based upon the opinions of expert teachers, subject matter experts, measurement experts, and a minority group which screened the items in terms of appropriateness for various cultural groups.

Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching. As an adjunct to formal evaluation procedures, significant time should be spent in the diagnostic/ prescriptive phase of the evaluative process. During this phase, an informal study skills inventory is completed with the student using an interview format. Probing techniques are employed in order to understand clearly what deliberate steps the student utilizes

when studying.

Further, actual instructional sessions are conducted in order to observe how the student organizes and processes information while learning specific content. Again, probing techniques are utilized to glean essential information about the student's executive strategies.

Individual Student Assessment

In the implementation of the team approach to student assessment, a three step process for diagnosis and program planning is employed by the University's Program for LD College Students. These steps are illustrated in Figure 2 and include screening, diagnosis, and program planning.

Insert Figure 2 about here.

Initial screening of college students with "potential" learning disabilities includes the completion of referral information and an intake interview. Referral forms are completed in writing by each prospective student, and contain information regarding the following: reasons for referral, description of perceived learning problems, previous services, and anticipated or desired services. This referral information is reviewed and forms the basis for the initial interview. If the student has been previously diagnosed, but lacks current evaluation data or, if the possibility exists

that undetermined learning deficits are interfering with a student's achievement, further assessment is often recommended. While formal diagnostic instruments are employed, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching sessions are instrumental in the evaluation process.

In all cases, two or more evaluators are involved in the assessment and report writing process. Typically, one of the evaluators is a school psychologist and one a special educator. The student is also actively involved in the interpretation of evaluation results. Test results and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching information are synthesized using a "profile analysis" technique (Cawley, 1977). Through the use of this technique, patterns of strength and weakness are visually displayed, lending clarification to error patterns and pinpointing areas for remediation. This technique also provides the team of evaluators with a method for incorporating their respective test data. Table 1 illustrates a completed psychoeducational profile for one student.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Translating evaluation data into understandable and useful information is quite obviously the ultimate objective of this type of comprehensive process. Reports of this

nature have proved to be extremely useful to the LD student and to the learning disabilities specialist acting in a service delivery capacity. Finally, the findings form a basis for developing instructional goals and objectives for each student.

In support of this process, a preliminary study employing psychoeducational evaluation data collected at the University of Connecticut (Norlander, Paolitto, Czajkowski, 1985) was undertaken. While only sixteen LD students were involved in this study, an examination of the group data indicated the need to examine, in juxtaposition, results of both psychological and educational evaluations. Further, this study suggests that evaluators must examine not only the general ability of the student and what the student "knows", but how the student processes or learns new information.

PROGRAM SELECTION

As students with learning disabilities are currently the fastest growing segment of college students with disabilities, high school and college personnel are increasingly in the position of counseling prospective applicants or making admissions recommendations. In fact, the HEATH Newsletter (Learning Disability Update, 1986), notes that the incidence of learning disabled freshmen has increased tenfold since 1978.

Special educators, counselors, and private consultants face numerous questions from high school students and their parents regarding college-level support programs for the learning disabled. Seeking the "best" learning disability support program frequently becomes the overriding issue. However, as concerned professionals, we often are in a position to help the student identify strengths and weaknesses, make critical career decisions, specify the kinds of support services necessary for success and select an appropriate higher education setting.

Unfortunately, many postsecondary resource guides provide little useful information other than names of institutions which purport to have support programs and a cursory listing of services. A systematic way to both counsel and make admissions decisions regarding learning disabled students is needed. The McGuire-Shaw Postsecondary Selection Guide for Learning Disabled Students (MSG) (McGuire & Shaw, 1986) was developed in response to this need. The MSG facilitates a comparison of the student's learning needs in juxtaposition with the characteristics of the postsecondary institution and the LD support program.

Insert Figure 3 about here.

Figure 3 contains segments of Part I of the MSG. As the

MSG is specifically designed to assist students in the selection of an appropriate college setting, this instrument is particularly useful for high school personnel in efforts to counsel students regarding appropriate college options. The MSG can also be used by personnel in community or junior college settings as LD students consider transfer choices. It would also be helpful for use by staff of competitive colleges in screening, counseling and admitting prospective LD students as admissions personnel evaluate the prospective student's ability to successfully compete at that particular institution (Vogel, 1982). The three components of this instrument a) characteristics of the LD students, b) characteristics of the institution, and c) characteristics of the LD support program, will be discussed in detail.

Characteristics of the LD Student

The first section of the MSG should be completed by the student with the assistance of parents, high school personnel, and/or other professionals who have worked with the student. Critical in determining a suitable school for pursuing the goal of a postsecondary education is an awareness of the student's learning abilities. Achievement levels of the student must be considered in selecting a college (see Item 1, Figure 3). Performance on valid and reliable tests expressed in grade equivalencies in areas of reading, writing, spelling, and math should be specified as

indicators of the student's current level of functioning (Blalock & Dixon, 1982).

An individually administered test of intelligence provides data about a student's potential for college study. Scale scores as well as subtest scores from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (WAIS-R) or the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-R (WISC-R) which has been administered within the past three years should be recorded. These data, in addition to scores from the Bloomer Learning Test described earlier, are useful in determining an applicant's abilities and learning style as well as potential for college work (Vogel, 1986).

Other factors of importance include study skills and social/emotional characteristics. Motivation, personal responsibility and commitment to becoming an independent learner are critical determinants for the success of LD college students (Barbaro, 1982). In completing Item 3 (see Figure 3), the student should be rated objectively by a teacher or counselor to help him/her determine strengths and weaknesses which bear heavily upon college performance. The student might also complete this section and then compare ratings with those of a professional. This process may afford a valuable opportunity for discussion and advising.

Self-awareness is often the student's key to recognizing what strategies may be necessary to facilitate transition

from high school to college. A thorough understanding of one's learning strengths and weaknesses is the starting point from which future planning should originate. For example, a student may be particularly adept at oral communication but weak in auditory memory. This profile may suggest a need to use a tape recorder for class lectures and a strength for courses which emphasize class discussions and oral presentations.

High school performance must be considered (Item 5). This section is designed to analyze the nature of the student's high school experience. By reviewing the level of coursework in which the student has participated, determination regarding preparation for academic demands of a particular college can be made.

Requirements of postsecondary institutions in terms of specific units of coursework vary, so it is important for an applicant to evaluate his/her ability to fulfill such requirements as well as the degree of success experiences in various content areas while in high school. Information regarding a student's class rank as well as grade point average will be valuable in comparison with similar data for students attending a college under consideration.

Quantitative data about high school performance needs to be assessed. Since each institution's postsecondary curriculum and course objectives are designed with knowledge

of the "typical" student profile, efforts to match an individual's characteristics to those of other students entering the college under consideration can eliminate frustration and possible failure due to uninformed decision-making.

The LD student should consider type and extent of supportive services which were utilized in high school (see Item 7). Whether a student has participated in a self-contained class, a resource room, or an individually-paced curriculum will shed light upon continuing needs for services in a college setting. Frequently, LD high school students are provided subject matter tutoring by LD resource personnel to equip them to meet mainstream class requirements. Whether this approach will be effective at the college level where pacing and amounts of material covered are more demanding must be investigated.

Characteristics of the Institution

A number of academic considerations are critical to the learning disabled student. A student with specific disabilities in writing or foreign language needs to know the number of required or core courses in each area. The availability of pre-college courses, developmental/ remedial courses and course waiver provisions is essential information. The size of the institution itself, as well as the size of classes, particularly the number of required

large lecture classes, may be particularly important to learning disabled students with any of the social or interpersonal problems which may characterize them (Barbaro, 1982). Finally, it is necessary for these students to ascertain the institution's policies regarding reduced courseload. These questions require systematic visits to a campus with discussions at Admissions, Academic Departments, Student Affairs and Residential Life in addition to Disabled Student Services. The following section will focus on the learning disability support program itself.

Characteristics of the Learning Disability Program

Once the learning disabled student has carefully evaluated personal strengths and weaknesses and considered the elements of a postsecondary institution which would be appropriate, it is then necessary to consider learning disability support services. A student with specific disabilities in math might not require support services if the postsecondary institutions of choice do not require coursework in math. On the other hand, a student who achieved in "modified" high school classes without support services might require extensive assistance in a competitive academic university program. The same student might continue to manage independently in an open enrollment, two-year college with a vocational-technical focus. An analysis of both the availability and quality of support services which

are needed by the student is essential.

A good place to start such an assessment is with admissions. Are modified admissions procedures available if they are needed? How does the applicant compare to other learning disabled students in the program?

A critical aspect of any program is personnel who provide direct services. A problem is evident in the fact that fewer than 10% of college disabled student services personnel, who generally have responsibility for these programs, are trained in special education (Blosser, 1984). Numbers of professionals have noted that service providers often lack relevant experience or training to fulfill the many responsibilities associated with these programs (Shaw & Norlander, 1986). A learning disability program which does not have staff who are trained, certified and experienced learning disability practitioners would be of questionable value. It is important for key personnel to have competence in learning disability diagnosis, and program planning. This expertise is critical because an effective learning disability college program must be characterized by a clear relationship between diagnosis, prescription, program objectives, and program services. It is not sufficient to simply have instructional, tutorial and testing services available. These services need to be focused on specific needs indicated by assessment such that effective support can

be provided. For learning disability students who may require an array of support services, it is also very beneficial to have one person develop, coordinate and monitor all services provided to an individual student.

The student's analysis of learning strengths and weaknesses should lead to a determination of necessary support services required to meet the demands of the postsecondary institution(s). The student would then determine the types and amount of tutoring, counseling (academic, personal, career), testing accommodations, curriculum modifications, direct instruction and compensatory accommodations to seek from a learning disability college program. Given the spelling, writing, language and handwriting problems of many learning disabled students, the word processing capabilities of computers are often critical. It is important to determine the availability of computers and computer instruction. Additional considerations relate to the existence of peer support groups, effectiveness of L.D. program staff, collaboration with college faculty and the average amount of support service provided to each learning disabled student.

Finally, it is important to determine whether a structured program is available or just regular support services (learning lab, study center, writing lab, etc.), which the student or a staff member can "string together." A

structured program would be based on a thorough diagnostic evaluation, provide for the specification of objective program goals developed from the diagnostic data, and deliver coordinated services by trained professionals to achieve those data-based goals.

Summary

The complex process of selecting the appropriate postsecondary program for students with learning disabilities begins with a thorough assessment of student characteristics and consequent needs. A process for evaluating student characteristics is presented including a suggested battery of reliable and valid diagnostic instruments. This evaluation process should include not only measures of aptitude, learning and academic achievement, but should also stress self-reports of social and study skills as well as a complete description of the student's high school program and performance levels within this program.

Following the delineation of student characteristics and past school experiences, the postsecondary program must be equally defined. Both institutional variables and support services must be outlined. The process of finding the best match between the student's strengths and weaknesses and institution/program characteristics can then be made. Including valid and reliable data in a comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation which is employed in completing

the MSG will enable special services personnel in the identification of appropriate postsecondary experiences for learning disabled students.

REFERENCES

Barbaro, F. (1982). The learning disabled college student: Some considerations in setting objectives. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15(10), 599-603.

Beatty, L.S., Madden, R., Gardner, E.G., & Larsen, B. (1976). Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test. Cleveland: The Psychological Corporation.

Blalock, G., & Dixon, N. (1982). Improving prospects for the college-bound learning disabled. Topics in Learning and Learning Disabilities, 2(3), 67-78.

Bloomer, R.H. (1978). The Bloomer Learning Test. Livonia, NY: Brador Publications.

Blosser, R.E. (1984). The roles and functions and the preparation of disabled student service directors in higher education (Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale). University Microfilms No. 8425117.

Buktenica, N.A. (1970). A multidisciplinary training team in the public schools. Journal of School Psychology, 8(3), 220-225.

Buktenica, N.A. (1980). Special education and school psychology: Whither the relationship. School Psychology Review, 9(3), 228-233.

Cawley, J.F. (1977). Meeting the learning and behavioral needs of handicapped children via a subject matter

emphasis: A training institute for general and special educators, diagnosticians and administrators. Portland, ME: Psycho-Educational Associates.

Gardner, E.F., Callis, R., Merwin, J.C., & Rudman, H.C. (1983). Stanford Test of Academic Skills. Cleveland: The Psychological Corporation.

Hammill, D.D., & Larsen, S.C. (1983). Test of Written Language. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Hanna, G.S., & Orleans, J.B. (1982). Orleans-Hanna Algebra Prognosis Test. Cleveland: The Psychological Corporation.

Karlsen, B., Madden, R., & Gardner, E.F. (1974). Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Cleveland: The Psychological Corporation.

Larsen, S.C., & Hammill, D.D. (1986). Test of Written Spelling-2. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Learning disability update. (1986, May). Information from HEATH, p. 3.

Lincoln, A.L. (1951). Lincoln Intermediate Spelling Test. Princeton, NJ: Educational Records Bureau.

McGuire, J.M., & Shaw, S.F. (1986). McGuire-Shaw postsecondary selection guide and manual for learning disabled students. Storrs, CT: McGuire & Associates.

Mellard, D.F., & Deshler, D.D. (1984). Modeling the condition of learning disabilities on postsecondary populations. Educational Psychologist, 19(3), 188-197.

Norlander, K.A., Paolitto, A., & Czajkowski, A.J. (1985, December). Evaluation of learning disabled college students: A profile analysis approach. Paper presented at the American Reading Forum Conference, Sarasota, FL.

Pfeiffer, S.I. (1980). The school based interprofessional team: Recurring problems and some possible solutions. Journal of School Psychology, 18(4), 388-394.

Pfeiffer, S.I. (1981). The problems facing multidisciplinary teams: As perceived by team members. Psychology in The Schools, 18, 330-333.

Raven, J.C., Court, J.H., & Raven, J. (1979). Raven Standard Progressive Matrices. London: H.K. Lewis & Company, LTD.

Shaw, S.F., & Norlander, K.A. (1986). The special educator's role in training for personnel to provide assistance to college students with learning disabilities. Teacher Education and Special Education, 9(2), 77-81.

The National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (1985, February). A call to action. A position paper of the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. Baltimore, MD: The Orton Dyslexia Society. Reproduction in Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 9(2), 164-168.

Vetter, A. (1983). A retrospective study of learning disabled adults. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas.

Vogel, S.A. (1982). On developing LD college programs. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15(9), 518-527.

Vogel, S.A. (1986). Levels and patterns of intellectual functioning among LD college students: Clinical and educational implications. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 19(2), 71-79.

Wechsler, D. (1981). Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised. New York: Psychological Corporation.

White, W.J., Alley, G.R., Deshler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Warner, M.M., & Clarke, F.L. (1982). Are there learning disabilities after high school? Exceptional Children, 49, 273-274.

SUGGESTED ASSESSMENT BATTERY FOR LD COLLEGE STUDENTS

CORE BATTERY

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised (Wechsler, 1981)

Bloomer Learning Test (Bloomer, 1978)

Stanford Test of Academic Skills (Gardner, Callis, Merwin, & Rudman, 1983)

ADDITIONAL DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENTS

Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching Sessions

Informational Study SKills Inventory

Lincoln Intermediate Spelling Test (Lincoln, 1951)

Orleans-Hanna Algebra Prognosis Test (Hanna & Orleans, 1982)

RAVEN Test of Progressive Matrices (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1979)

Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test (Beatty, Madden, Gardner, & Larsen, 1976)

Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (Karlsen, Madden, & Gardner, 1974)

Test of Written Language (Hammill & Larsen, 1983)

Test of Written Spelling-2 (Larsen & Hammill, 1986)

Figure 1. Suggested Assessment Battery for LD College Students

Table 1

Psychoeducational Test Profile

Learner's Name Bill
CA 22
IQ (full scale) 116

APTITUDE/INFORMATION PROCESSING	ACADEMIC SKILLS	STUDY SKILLS
Non-Verbal Reasoning Ability (Raven, %tile-95)	Vocabulary (TASK, %tile 98, Stanine 9)	Time Management
Acquired Knowledge (WAIS-R, Information SS 16 (WAIS-R, Vocabulary SS 13 (WAIS-R, Comprehension SS 16 (WAIS-R, Similarities SS 15	Reading Comprehension (TASK, %tile Stanine 9)	Completion of tasks assigned 100% of the time. (Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching Sessions)
Concepts Production (BLT - SS 16)		
Concepts Recognition (BLT - SS 16		
ASSOCIATION (BLT, Assoc., SS 10)	Math (TASK, %tile 63, Stanine 6)	
Memory (WAIS-R, Digit Span, SS 8) (WAIS-R, Digit Symbol, SS 7) (WAIS-R, Arithmetic, SS 8) (BLT, Visual STM, sequential presentation, SS 8) (BLT, Auditory STM, sequential presentation, SS 6) (BLT, Visual STM, simultaneous presentation, SS 8) (BLT, Recall, SS 1)	English (Task, %tile 43, Stanine 4) Spelling (Task, %tile 31, Stanine 2)	No self-questioning while studying Textbook Comprehension - attempts to recall everything. (Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching Sessions)
Paired Associate Learning (BLT, PA, SS 6)		
Problem Solving (BLT, PS, SS 6)		
Activity (BLT, ACT, SS 5)		

KEY

WAIS-R - Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Revised
BLT - Bloomer Learning Test
TASK - Stanford Test of Academic Skills
SS - Scaled Score, All reported scaled scores have a mean of 10 and a standard deviation of 3.

OVERVIEW OF ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING PROCEDURES

STEP I: SCREENING

A. Collection of Referral Information

B. Initial Interview(s) with Program Coordinator

C. Meeting with a Learning Specialist

STEP II: DIAGNOSIS

The diagnostic process has two main purposes, to determine program eligibility and to identify learning strengths and weaknesses for program planning.

A. Evaluation Process:

1. Formal Evaluation Procedures
2. Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching

B. Report Writing Process:

A team report (Psychoeducational Evaluation) is written, taking into account both formal evaluation and teaching results. The student, as a critical team member, is actively involved in this process.

STEP III: PROGRAM PLANNING

A. University Planning Meeting

1. Review of evaluation data
2. Determination of program eligibility
3. Recommended support services
4. Recommended specific educational goals

B. Development of Individual Educational Plan

1. Formulation of instructional goals and objectives
2. Initiation of a contract between student and program

Figure 2. Overview of Assessment and Planning Procedures

1. Academic Skills: Current level of functioning in the following areas:

	Grade Level	Date of Assessment	Assessment Instrument
a. Reading			
- decoding	_____	_____	_____
- comprehension	_____	_____	_____
- vocabulary	_____	_____	_____
b. Written Language			
- spelling	_____	_____	_____
- mechanics: grammar, punctuation, syntax	_____	_____	_____
- organization of ideas	_____	_____	_____
- handwriting	_____	_____	_____
c. Mathematics			
- computation	_____	_____	_____
- solving word problems	_____	_____	_____
- higher level skills (algebra, geometry)	_____	_____	_____

3. Social/Study Skills: Rating scale (1 = weakness / 5 = strength)

Social	Rating	Study Skills	Rating
- Manifests appropriate social perception	_____	- Ability to manage time	_____
- Ability to interpret nonverbal communication	_____	- Completes assignments on time	_____
- Motivation to achieve	_____	- Demonstrates interest and commitment to studying	_____
- Self-concept	_____	- Works independently	_____
- Interactions with peers	_____	- Takes good lecture notes	_____
- Ability to accept criticism	_____	- Ability to set goals and priorities	_____
- Ability to deal w/stress	_____	- Ability to self-monitor study habits	_____
- Ability to function in small groups	_____	- Ability to gather information from texts	_____
- Personal responsibility	_____		
- Self advocacy	_____		
- Ability to tolerate frustration	_____		

Figure 3. Sample Items from Part I, McGuire-Shaw Postsecondary Selection Guide for Learning Disabled Students

5. High School Program

High School Attended: _____

Indicate in which programs you took courses. Number of subject matter units: Use numbers 1 - 6 as appropriate (1 = most courses; 2 = 2nd most, etc.).

Advanced Placement Courses	_____	English	_____
College Preparatory Program	_____	Math	_____
Non-college preparatory Program	_____	History	_____
Vocational Work-study program	_____	Social Sciences	_____
Remedial Program	_____	Lab Sciences	_____
Special Education Program	_____	Foreign Language	_____
Individually paced instruction	_____		

List any course waivers.

7. Supportive services received in high school.

Total Number of Hours/Week: _____

Type of Program (check)	Type of Assistance (check)
_____ Resource Room	_____ Subject Matter Tutoring
_____ Self-contained class	_____ Study Skills/Learning Strategies
_____ Specialized school	_____ Homework
_____ Provate tutoring	_____ Testing modifications
_____ Psychotherapy/ Counseling	_____ Counseling

Figure 3. (continued)